

Clyffe-Pypard Neighbourhood Planning Group

Notes of the meeting held on 25th February 2020

Present:

Tony Currivan (Chair)
Chris Rickett (for items 1-4, plus start of 5)
Alan Glasspool (notes)
Ed Rudler
Nick Kirton
Peter Gantlett
Rosemary Greenway
Marian Kent
Chris Thompson

Apologies:

Meeting Objective: To review project status and agree on next steps.

1. Statement from Peter Gantlett

a. Peter Gantlett read the following statement to the meeting;

During last months meeting there was a discussion on alternative sites to Bishops Farm for affordable Housing .

Someone said they couldn't see a private landowner putting forward land , because of the land value for affordable housing .

At that point I said Anita and I owned the field behind Withy Close , and we were willing for it to be considered if that was what the community would want , so there could be others.

I also stated we would only want its agricultural value.

I thought it was understood by the meeting we were not going to benefit from this and it was being done for the potential benefit of the community. After the meeting there has been persistent accusations and some of that has been minuted.

I referred my situation to the Council's Monitoring officer for advice.

His advice is not to put myself in a situation that could give rise to an accusation of a conflict of interest. However remote.

I have discussed this with Anita , and we have reluctantly agreed to withdraw our land from any consideration for Affordable Housing .

2. Appoint new chair

- a. Tony Currivan was the only name put forward for the role.
- b. The meeting unanimously voted in favour of Tony becoming the chair.
- c. Tony agreed to contact Jane Wilkie (WCC link officer) to inform her of his new role. **Action: TC**

3. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting
 - a. Peter Gantlett requested that versions of draft minutes should be clearer in showing changes. Alan Glasspool will ensure this is done in future. **Action: AG**
 - b. Peter Gantlett stated that paragraph 3h should be removed
 - c. Tony Currivan disagreed as this was an accurate statement of what was said
 - d. Marian Kent asked who had raised the idea of the £50 voucher. Alan Glasspool stated it came from an idea used by other parishes doing neighbourhood plans to encourage a higher return of questionnaires. Marian wanted to ensure that this would be approved by the parish council. Peter Gantlett agreed to take this request for funds to the next parish council meeting. **Action: PG**
 - e. The minutes from the last meeting were approved. These were version 3 distributed with the agenda.
4. Matters Arising
 - a. Call for Sites on non council owned land
 - i. Alan Glasspool asked for an explanation of the background and what had happened regarding the call for sites made in the 1st February parish newsletter. This is because this could well impact on the NP when considering land later.
 - ii. Peter Gantlett explained
 1. The parish council had initiated the Housing Survey
 2. The parish council took the responsibility to undertake the call for sites for affordable housing. These can be delivered outside of a neighbourhood plan using the rural exception site policy
 3. Now that the WCC plans had changed it was back with us to progress
 4. The call for sites, for affordable housing only, went out via the parish newsletter and website only and did not include any attempt to contact landowners direct
 5. Peter is not aware of any responses so far
 6. Peter is also carrying out research to understand what options may be available to help deliver the required affordable housing and what the reality might be. This includes investigating Community Land Trusts.
 - iii. Alan Glasspool stated it is possible to identify a site for affordable housing through the NP
 - iv. This would be within the formal NP processes where any decisions will be backed up by evidence and community involvement

- v. Tony Currivan asked how the current call for sites will link into the NP activity
 - vi. Nick Kirton said his initial thought was that it would be better if there was coordinated activity between the parish council and the NP. Separating the call for sites could create mixed messages.
 - vii. Chris Thompson said that because of the WCC affordable housing change of plans, hares had been sent running and that it would be better to carry out any future call for sites including both affordable and market housing within the NP
 - viii. Chris Rickett stated with the two remaining separate there was a danger of the right hand not knowing what the left was doing
 - ix. Nick Kirton stated that a decision was required of what the next steps are with this call for sites to inform NP next steps
 - x. Peter will be reporting back to the parish council on the 17th March and will then subsequently update this group both with the results of the call for sites and his research. **Action: PG**
 - xi. Marian Kent expressed concern that at the parish council there was not the understanding or level of interest needed to progress this
 - xii. Alan Glasspool stated that the call for sites carried out did not comply with the NP process requirements as;
 - 1. There was insufficient explanation given of the site allocation process and what is expected from landowners and those analysing the results
 - 2. the request communication was incorrect by stating WCC's involvement
 - 3. there was no attempt made to try to contact all land owners
 - xiii. The group agreed that between us we have sufficient information and understanding to undertake a full and complete call for sites when required
 - xiv. Rosemary Greenway stated that Peter Gantlett's offer may turn out to have been the best
- b. WCC affordable housing position
- i. Tony Currivan stated that following a conversation with Allison Bucknell there was the possibility of the WCC affordable housing plans being an option for the parish sooner than the 5 years mentioned in her last note

5. Questionnaire

- a. Chris Rickett handed out the following note presenting her views on the events of the last week and giving her proposals for the way forward on the testing of the questionnaire:

Clyffe Pypard Parish Council Questionnaire and 'Road-test' – The way forward

I propose that the feedback on the questionnaire from the unnamed respondents must be disregarded. This exercise appears to have been undertaken to undermine the process agreed by the Steering Group at the last meeting. It also feels like an attempt to continue to undermine me personally. It is certainly disrespectful and the sort of bullying behaviour that would go against everything the Parish Council's code of conduct stands for. If volunteers had been identified, any reasonable person would have expected them to be referred to me to take part in the agreed review process. I have put in a lot more work than some members of this group, and those who have done the least work seem to do nothing but criticise and dish out false accusations of bias.

The results cannot be validated because:

- It was produced without due process.
- Process and content were already agreed and confirmed by the steering group
- Respondents' comments were almost entirely about the content and process but not about the ease of completion – the point of the exercise
- Respondents were not selected by an open process
- There is no evidence that respondents were from diverse demographics
- There can be no confidence in the validity of the results
- This exercise has potentially undermined the communication with the community

I propose that the completion of the questionnaire preamble should be produced by Nick. As Nick is in charge of communication he will put forward a message that is consistent and can be agreed by the steering group.

I propose that a valid road-test is still required. Individuals who have already looked at the questionnaire should be named and not used again. Unfortunately, misdirection as to the purpose of the previous exercise will make it difficult for them to approach this with fresh perspective.

I propose a new group is sought by once again putting out a call for volunteers. I already have a possible 3 who replied to the original Nextdoor post. Unfortunately, the Parish Clerk's e-mail bore no fruit. To widen the demographic diversity, I suggest that we explicitly seek people who are not on social media. I hope Marian, as the longest standing member of the community in our group, can possibly help to identify a few candidates.

I propose that as soon as I have a minimum of 6 volunteers I will arrange 2 sessions (to make it easy for them to take part). I am keen to follow best

practice in neighbourhood planning and access a diverse group which may include someone with mobility limitations. In this event, rather than exclude them from the process I would be happy to arrange to visit them.

I envisage that this exercise could be completed by the next scheduled NP meeting at the end of March and the results shared with the group. At that point, if any clarity issues arise I will report them to the group and they can be discussed. If for any reason it seems that the process is delayed in any way I will report this to the group.

- b. Chris said that she did not want to spend time with the group but would see everyone at the next meeting. Chris then left the meeting
- c. Peter Gantlett gave his response to the events of the last week
 - i. Peter said he was responding to the criticism he had received with relation to the running of testing of the questionnaire
 - ii. At the last meeting the actions were agreed for testing the questionnaire
 - iii. Peter sent notes to Chris offering support and possible dates for use of the village hall. He did not want to tread on anybody's toes
 - iv. A series of emails were sent involving Peter, Chris and Alan.
 - v. Peter enquired of Alan if progress was being made. Alan stated he would come back after speaking to Chris
 - vi. Alan met with Chris the next day and a plan was agreed. Alan documented this in an email to the whole group.
 - vii. Peter said he was expecting direct communication from Alan
 - viii. Peter felt he was getting his head bitten off whenever communication was attempted
 - ix. Chris sent a note out on the 18th Feb including the questionnaire and explaining the issues with getting names and that she would discuss at the next steering group
 - x. Peter stated that he did not receive this email as an old email address had been used
 - xi. At the last meeting there had been a lot of discussion on one word in Question 6 (old numbering). Peter felt agreement had been reached to change from 'existing community' to 'parish'. This had not been changed on the subsequent updated questionnaire (new question 5) sent out on 18th February.
 - xii. Peter then decided to speak to 4 people and asked for feedback on the questionnaire.
 - xiii. Peter stated that his primary aim was to get things done and not to create problems

- d. Other comments from the group
 - i. Alan Glasspool restated that for any member of the group to take over, without agreement, someone else's task is unacceptable
 - ii. The impact on the original owner, the whole group and potentially the community does not justify wanting to get something done
 - iii. If people have concerns about how a task is going then write to the steering group or even better phone the person concerned to see if you can help
 - iv. Tony Currivan stated that within this process we need to do things properly as it could affect the validity of the process when assessed by the Inspector
 - v. Alan Glasspool stated that Chris Rickett's aims for the testing were to test the ease and timing of completion. It is not to critique the questions which this group had signed off at the previous meeting
 - vi. Tony Currivan stated that Chris had the marketing expertise required for this task
 - vii. Nick Kirton said we also need to ensure what we do is transparent and evidenced and in line with the required process
 - viii. Alan Glasspool stated that Chris Rickett was very conscious of getting a balanced, representative group involved in the testing so that there could be not accusation of bias. This is what led to the need to think again on the testing
 - ix. Marian Kent said we all need to show understanding and support to each other. We don't always know what else is going on and after all we are volunteers
 - x. Marian said that we all need to remember we all have the same aim for the project
 - xi. Tony Currivan stated that we should put all our energies in pulling together to get these things done
 - xii. Peter said he will reach out to Chris and apologise. **Action: PG**

- e. Testing Proposal
 - i. Tony Currivan requested that Chris Rickett ask for assistance should she be unable to have the questionnaire testing completed by the next meeting. Action: CR
 - ii. Peter Gantlett said he thought it was a mistake to dismiss his findings as he felt the responses could inform the questionnaire
 - iii. Chris Thompson suggested that the review answers could be considered

- iv. Alan Glasspool responded that it had not been Peter’s responsibility and that the exercise did not achieve what was required, as the aim was to test the ease and timing of completion with unbiased views from a balanced demographic sample of parishioners
- v. Tony Currivan added that should not enough volunteers be found then, in order to get the questionnaire completed as soon as possible, Chris Rickett might consider including the people who had already commented via Peter Gantlett – as a last resort.
- vi. Nick Kirton asked for any material or ideas relating to the preamble to be sent through. Alan Glasspool agreed to send through some thoughts that he had. **Action: ALL**
- vii. The group accepted that the word ‘parish’ should be in the new Question 5 in the questionnaire. Chris Rickett to update. **Action: CR**
- viii. The group agreed that Chris Rickett should proceed as she proposed and that she keeps the group up to date with progress. **Action: CR**

6. Communication

- a. Nick Kirton will draft an update for 1st March newsletter and distribute for any comments. **Action: NK**
- b. Nick also mentioned that for the 1st April there will need to be a draft sent round before the next meeting. **Action: NK**

7. Next Meeting

- a. The next meeting is Tuesday 31st March.

Action List

No.	Action	Resp.	Date Raised	Date Reqd	Status
63	Request for sites for affordable housing to be produced and distributed.	GR	28/1/20	5/2/20	
64	Request for affordable housing to be discussed with WCC.	GR	28/1/20	5/2/20	
65	Questionnaire – update section at the beginning with context of WCC affordable housing proposal and CP Housing Survey.	NK	25/2/20	6/3/20	
66	Questionnaire – updated following feedback from steering meeting and distributed back to the steering group.	CR	28/1/20	5/2/20	Done
67	Questionnaire – share with WCC to get feedback.	TC	28/1/20	TBC	
68	Acquire up to date address list for the parish	TC	28/1/20	TBC	
69	Questionnaire focus group – arrange for contact of the Drop In group and acquire volunteers for focus group.	GR	28/1/20	5/2/20	

70	Questionnaire focus group – arrange focus group session(s) and carry out dry run of questionnaire completion.	CR	28/1/20	18/2/20	
71	Questionnaire – updated following focus groups and distributed to steering group ahead of next meeting (25 th Feb).	CR	28/1/20	23/2/20	
72	Questionnaire – remaining process will be documented in detail with specific actions and responsibilities.	AG	28/1/20	7/2/20	
73	Communication update for 1 st February 2020 Newsletter	NK	28/1/20	29/1/20	Done
74	Update and distribute project timeline.	AG	28/1/20	TBC	
75	Questionnaire testing group – arrange testing group session(s) and carry out dry run of questionnaire completion.	CR	25/2/20	13/3/20	
76	Questionnaire – updated following focus groups and distributed to steering group ahead of next meeting (31 st Mar).	CR	25/2/20	20/3/20	
77	Questionnaire – remaining process will be documented in detail with specific actions and responsibilities.	AG	25/2/20	20/3/20	
78	Inform Jane Wilkie (WCC) link officer of new chair	TC	25/2/20	6/3/20	
79	Ensure any versions of minutes include clear explanation of changes	AG	25/2/20	Ongoing	
80	Request to parish council for funds for £50 voucher.	PG	25/2/20	17/3/20	
81	Following the parish council meeting update this group both with the results of the call for sites and PG's research.	PG	25/2/20	31/3/20	
82	Peter to apologise to Chris R.	PG	25/2/20	6/3/20	
83	To ask for assistance if unable to have questionnaire tested by next meeting	CR	25/2/20	Ongoing	
84	Provide any material and ideas for the Questionnaire preamble to NK	All	25/2/20	6/3/20	
85	Update Question 5 in the questionnaire with the word 'parish'.	CR	25/2/20	6/3/20	
86	Keep group up to date with Questionnaire testing progress	CR	25/2/20	31/3/20	
87	Communication update for 1 st March 2020 Newsletter	NK	25/2/20	28/2/20	
88	Communication update for 1 st April 2020 Newsletter	NK	25/2/20	24/3/20	

Project Calendar and Timelines to be updated.

